

REMARKS

The Office Action rejects claims 15-16 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammond in view of Morita (JP 2002238504) and further in view of Campbell (US patent 1452907). Applicant has cancelled claims 15-16 and 18-20. Therefore, the 103 rejection is considered moot.

Applicant has introduced new claims 21-36. The new independent claims 21, 26, and 32 recite numerous specific details of the method of preparing a body for burial, many of which are not found in the cited prior art. For example, none of the references Hammond, Morita, or Campbell - taken singularly or in combination - teach or suggest placing kapa cloth composed of degradable materials, particularly including the specially prepared bark of the mulberry tree, on the tray of the vessel, or wrapping the body with kapa cloth as a preparatory step as claimed to minimize direct contact/related handling with the body and ensure moisture retention. Moreover, none of the cited references teach or suggest conducting a final ritual over the body as claimed. Finally, none of the cited references teach or suggest injecting steam at 212 degrees Fahrenheit with a mass flow rate of 1000 lbs/hour through a plurality of steam jets lining an interior wall of the vessel for a time period between four and five hours to cause tissue of the body to separate from bone structure thereby rendering a clean bone structure with no remaining tissue or residue, or the later collection of degraded kapa cloth and pela in a container for disposal. The new independent claims 21, 26, and 32 are believed to patentably distinguish over the Hammond, Morita, Campbell, and other references, such as Houfek, Kozinczuk, and

USPTO Serial Number: 10/729,136
Kunani, N.
Response to Office Action dated June 30, 2006


Maniscalco references, taken singularly or in combination. The dependent claims 22-25, 27-31, and 32-36 are believed to be in condition for allowance as each is dependent from an allowable base claim.

Applicant believes that all information and requirements for the application have been provided to the USPTO. If there are matters that can be discussed by telephone to further the prosecution of the Application, Applicant invites the Examiner to call the undersigned attorney at the Examiner's convenience.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees due with this Response to U.S. PTO Account No. 17-0055.

Respectfully submitted,
QUARLES & BRADY STREICH LANG LLP

August 16, 2006

By: 
John A. Griffiths
Reg. No. 57,654

Address all correspondence to:

John A. Griffiths
Quarles & Brady Streich Lang LLP
One Renaissance Square
Two North Central Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85004
Telephone: (602) 229-5247
Facsimile: (602) 420-5147
Email: jgriffit@quarles.com